

MEETING SUMMARY

CINCINNATI MUNICIPAL LUNKEN AIRPORT CTAG#5 February 17, 2004

Meeting called by: City of Cincinnati
Facilitator: Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division
Meeting summary prepared by PB Aviation

Attendees:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Albert Peter, Anderson Township Trustee/LAOAB | 17. Bill Ohl, FAA-CVG David Rattenbury, LAAUC/CFTC |
| 2. Michael Burns, Indian Hill | 18. Tom Ewing, Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce |
| 3. Salty Roark, LNC | 19. Bill Posey, FBO Rep. |
| 4. Susan Halzapfel, Indian Hill/LAOAB | 20. Tom Edwards, Flight Depot |
| 5. Steve Crow, ATCT | 21. Mike Lacinak, Mt. Washington Community Council |
| 6. Steve Fagel, City Law Department | 22. Kathy Tyler, Midwest Jet/FBO |
| 7. Will Brown, Mt. Lookout Civic Club | 23. Deborah Conrad, KCAB-CVG |
| 8. Joseph Bagby, Mt. Washington | 24. JoAnna Brown, DOT&E |
| 9. Barbara Seitis, Mt Washington | 25. Reginald Victor, City of Cincinnati, DOT&E |
| 10. Harold Blocher II, City of Highland Heights | 26. Mike Brenner, DOT&E Aviation Division |
| 11. Bryan Snyder, Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission | 27. Dan Dickten, Lunken Airport Administrator, DOT&E |
| 12. Andrew Betts, Sierra Club | 28. Eileen Enabnit, Director, DOT&E |
| 13. Erik Nelson, Private Pilots | 29. Don Rosemeyer, City Engineer, DOT&E |
| 14. Judy Zehren, Mt Washington | 30. Bob Vickrey, City of Cincinnati, DOT&E |
| 15. Scot Conover, Columbia Tusculum Community Council | 31. Cheri Rekow, Aviation Division, DOT&E |
| 16. Jennifer Edwards, Cincinnati Enquirer | 32. Ed Cecil, PB Aviation |
| | 33. Bart Gover, PB Aviation |

Agenda Topic	Presenter	Discussion
Greeting & Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City staff, Consultants, CTAG /CTAG-AC members Opening comments 	Eileen Enabnit, Director, DOT&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms. Enabnit explained reasons for delay in sending out the revised draft of the Mission, Goals & Objectives in advance of this meeting. Responses were still coming in and the City wanted to make every effort to address all comments in the revised draft. Since CTAG did not receive copy of the draft in advance, extra time for discussion will be provided tonight and continue at the next meeting. The Community Segment of the CTAG-AC met on 2/10/04 and submitted suggestions, which staff incorporated into the current draft. The comments that were received 2/9/04 or later have to be considered further.
Review of CTAG Meeting #4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening comments 	Eileen Enabnit, Director, DOT&E Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms. Enabnit explained that the revised draft of the goals and objectives represents our best effort to incorporate and reflect the intent of the wide range of comments we received, while still accurately depicting the City's obligations, policies, and responsibilities toward the Airport, the users, the FAA, and the community. Ms. Rekow gave an overview of revisions to the original draft, which included those discussed at the January meeting and summarized in the CTAG Meeting #4 Minutes). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Condense and strengthened language Eliminated ambiguous language Specific Changes:

		<p><u>Mission</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o More direct o Goal 1 became Goal 2 and visa-versa o Goal 4, 5 and part of 7 became a condensed Goal 4; Part of Goal 7 moved to the Mission, therefore Goal 6 became Goal 5 and Goal 8 became Goal 6 o We received suggestion for a Goal #9 and #10. Those were incorporated into Goals 3, 4, 5 and 6 and the Mission Statement (i.e. recognizing the Airport's unique setting...) <p>In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Mission serves to explain role of the Airport and references to FAA (as it applies to a facility plan) <p>Goals focus on 6 areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 1. Safety o 2. Changing Aviation needs o 3. Environmental Impacts o 4. Regional Goals and Plans o 5. Land Use o 6. Public Participation
<p>Review and Discussion of Mission, Goals & Objectives</p>	<p>Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Rekow facilitated group discussion of the current draft. Following is a summary of comments and suggestions to the draft dated, February 17, 2004: <p>Mission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Remove "vital" from the Mission Statement and be consistent throughout document. o Incorporate the word "noise" into the mission statement to address importance of surrounding communities. Discussion: most members supported keeping the mission statement the same due to Goal 3. Action: No changes proposed at this time. o Incorporate the concept of Lunken as a Gateway. <p>Goal 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Objective 1.4: Discussion regarding term "all-weather". The intent of the objectives is to insure conditions are as safe as possible during any weather condition. No action needed. <p>Goal 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Objective 2.1: Suggestion to include the words "reliever airport" in this objective to adhere to FAA's designation of LUK as a reliever airport. Discussion: most CTAG members thought no changes were necessary, because language is reflected in the Mission Statement, which applies to all goals and objectives. Action: No change made. o Objective 2.2: Discussion regarding when facilities are built. Suggestion to change the word "at" to "by" to strengthen objectives meaning. CTAG members concurred. Action: Make suggested change. o Objective 2.1: Concern expressed regarding use of words "provide opportunities". Conversely concern expressed with respect to non-discrimination of aircraft users at LUK. Discussion: CTAG members supported removing "provide opportunities". Action: Replace "provide opportunities" with "Allow". <p>General Comment: several CTAG member stressed importance of including words "corporate" and "general aviation" throughout goals and objectives. Staff will reassess.</p>

		<p>Goal 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 3.2: Suggestion to strengthen with opening an action word Discussion and clarification regarding reference to “environmental experts”. Suggestion made to add the word “appropriate” in front environmental experts. Action: make suggested change, remain open to additional suggestions in lieu of “Consult”, and consider adding language such as “and to extent possible, work to implement recommendations.” Objective 3.3: Suggestion to removing 3.3 in its entirety. Discussion: CTAG members agree it's redundant. Action: Delete Objective 3.3. Objective 3.4: Suggestion to removing 3.4 in its entirety. Discussion: CTAG members agree to its limited value. Action: Delete Objective 3.4. <p>General Comment: Some still want a separate Goal to address noise. Action: Hold further discussion of Goal 3 until further review of proposed objective to address noise at next CTAG meeting.</p> <p>Goal 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 4.4: Suggestion to remove 4.4, followed by discussion. CTAG members agree. Action: Delete Objective 4.4. Objective 4.5 and 4.1: Discussion regarding redundant language. CTAG members concur. Action: 4.1 and 4.5 to be combined and simplified to include the words “gateway concept” within objective. Action: Merge and refine language (staff). <p>Goal 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 5.1 and 5.2: Concern raised that words in both objectives do not adequately express the relationship of the surrounding communities and the Airport working together on issues such as land use and noise. Staff clarified that although airport sponsor has no legislative authority over surrounding municipalities the Airport should assume the burden of educating decision-makers and working with them to advocate for compatible land use development/redevelopment. Given the theme of Goal 5, Staff did not view this goal as a “two-way” responsibility, but agreed to revisit wording of 5.1 and 5.2 and bring back for discussion during next meeting. <p>Goal 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 6.1: CTAG member suggests adding the word “other” in front of the word “local” to clarify statement. Discussion: CTAG members agree. Action: Make suggested change.
Preliminary Airport Layout Plan Concepts	Eileen Enabnit, Director, DOT&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms. Enabnit, introduced the consultant and provided background regarding the development of Airport Layout Alternatives, including the, which began with the working session in December to gather CTAG ideas and feedback. This Alternative Layout phase is an extension of earlier planning exercises. We are trying on a number of arrangements of facilities. Some of the recommendations will be rejected, some modified, and some incorporated in their present arrangement. The outcome will most likely be a hybrid combination of all the Alternatives. She emphasized that individual projects within each Alternative are contingent on activity at the Airport. The Alternative concepts show possible physical development plans if the aviation operation forecasts are ever achieved. Some items to remember: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The facility needs are based on the forecasts. The forecast is not a goal or a target. It is a best professional prediction. This information, developed by an expert in the field based on national aviation trends, FAA methodology, and Lunken tenant

	Ed Cecil, PB Aviation	<p>plans was used to determine the facility needs and impacts on access roadways, the terminal building and other landside facilities, aircraft parking, runway capacity, and community noise levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Careful and prudent planning for the future is especially critical at Lunken since it is landlocked and the existing property must be used as effectively and efficiently as possible ○ Recommendations of the Master Plan will not become reality until they are warranted and City Council, the FAA, and administration are ready to proceed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Ed Cecil, PB Aviation presented the three conceptual Airport Alternative Layout Plans, explaining the projects, or variations of the project, incorporated in each. <p>Alternative A: Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A-1 Runway 3R-21L Extension - 899 feet to the south ○ A-2 Runway 7 Runway Safety Area (RSA) Extension ○ A-3 Runway 3R-21L Parallel Taxiway ○ A-4 Taxiway 'C' Relocation - 400 feet ○ A-5 North Corporate Lease Area ○ A-6 Mid-field Corporate Lease Area ○ A-7 FBO Lease Area Development ○ A-8 SASO Lease Area Development ○ A-9 Mid-field Air Traffic Control Tower Relocation ○ A-10 Hangar 3 Aviation Museum Site ○ A-11 Aeronautical Training College <p>Alternative B: Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B-1 Runway 3R-21L Extension - 899 feet to the north ○ B-2 Runway 7 Protection Zone (RPZ) ○ B-3 Runway 3R-21L Parallel Taxiway ○ B-4 Taxiway 'C' Relocation - 1,000 feet to the north ○ B-5 Corporate Lease Development Area ○ B-6 FBO Lease Development Area ○ B-7 SASO Lease Development Area ○ B-8 Air Traffic Control Tower Relocation ○ B-9 Hangar 3 Aviation Museum Site ○ B-10 Airport Office Park <p>Alternative C: Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C-1 Runway 3R-21L Extension - 450 feet north, 449 south ○ C-2 Runway 7 Relocated Threshold by 200 feet ○ C-3 Runway 3R-21L Parallel Taxiway ○ C-4 Taxiway 'C' Relocation - 400 feet ○ C-5 Corporate Lease Area Expansion along Wilmer Avenue ○ C-6 FBO Lease Area on Airport Road ○ C-7 SASO North Airfield Development Area ○ C-8 Air Traffic Control Tower Relocation ○ C-9 Hangar 3 Aviation Museum Site
Next Steps and General Comments:	Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consultant will present three Alternative Layouts of the facility needs. This is primarily to familiarize CTAG with the plans. ○ In the next two weeks CTAG will receive copies of the Alternatives with accompanying text for review, and discussion in detail at the March CTAG meeting. At that time, as a team, we will identify what arrangements of the facilities make the most sense. ○ The Alternatives will also be presented at the public workshop, March 25 to collect comments and input from the community at large. ○ Based on input from the CTAG meeting and Public Workshop, the

		<p>consultant will develop a hybrid—a combination of the best recommendations of the three plans for CTAG review in April.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target Dates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CTAG #6 Tuesday, March 16, 2004 ○ Public Workshop 1&2 Thursday, March 25, 2004 ○ CTAG #7 – Tuesday, April 20 (Hybrid Alternative) ○ Public Workshop #3 – May-June • It is highly important that the City takes a proactive approach to planning for the future of the Airport
	Don Rosemeyer, DOT&E	

Question & Answer Period - CTAG # 5

PB Aviation, February 17, 2004

1. The current critical aircraft for 2002 is the Gulfstream 4 (G-IV), but in reality the G-5 is at LUK today. Why hasn't the 2002 critical aircraft been updated to the G-5?

Answer: Because the G-550 (*isn't it already there?*) is planned to come into service within the 20-year planning period, it is not necessary to change the 2002 critical aircraft. The facility improvements needed for the G-5 are based on the forecasts and will occur (if approved) when activity levels require airport facilities to meet the actual demand. The importance of the critical aircraft is not necessarily the year the expected aircraft is to come into service but rather the presence of the facilities necessary to safely operate that aircraft. The facilities required to support the G-550 (runway extension) would be included in the short-term development plan (0-5 years).

2. In each of the Alternatives, Hangar #3 is proposed for relocation outside the Runway Safety Area (RSA). How will this be paid for?

Answer: One of the FAA's top concerns for LUK is the removal of obstructions from the RSA. Federal funds through the FAA typically provide for a 90/10 (90% Federal Grants, 10% local matching funds) match in order to clear obstructions from RSA. The 10% match would have to come from local funds such as private, City and/or airport funds to meet the grant obligation. Additional funding sources, such as private support, other federal sources, and the Aviation Fund will have to be identified and obtained if it is feasible to relocate Hanger 3.

3. As a result of lengthening Runway 3R, would the glide slope on 21L have to change?

Answer: No, the glide slope would remain the same but the localizer and supporting equipment would have to be moved to accommodate the 3R runway extension, if built.

4. Are the FAA's regulations regarding safety and cost benefit incorporated into each of the Alternatives presented here today?

Answer: Yes, a preliminary cost assessment was performed in Chapter 4.0 for each of the Alternatives and averaged between 23 and 25 million dollars per Alternative. The FAA's safety criteria are met in each Alternative to the fullest extent possible.

5. Two of the three Alternatives indicate the relocation of the drainage basin (currently in the midfield area) between the levee and 3R/21L. What types of environmental resources exist in the area planned for the new drainage basin?

Answer: The area consists of open grasslands, free of trees. This area was previously disturbed when the levee was constructed in the mid 1960's.

6. Do any of the flight paths change as a result of the master plan?

Answer: No, the ongoing Part 150 Study will make recommendations to modify flight paths for noise mitigation. If flight paths are revised, they will be included in the master plan.

7. What factors did PB use to justify developing towards the north or south?

Answer: Environmental impact, safety, and capital costs were used in determining the options for development.

8. How much of an impact to the golf course results from Alternative #3?

Answer: Approximately 25 to 30 acres of the golf course would be affected if Alternative #3 were implemented.

9. In Alternative #1, a waste of space seems to exist between each of the SASO areas. Why?

Answer: Space was purposely left in order to allow for SASO expansion beyond the 20-year plan.

10. Why are the RSA's and RPZ's areas so important to be free from obstructions?

Answer: In recent years, the FAA has placed a higher priority on making runway safety areas free from obstructions in order to establish a higher level of safety at airports throughout the US. A runway safety inspection team visited LUK and determined that Hangar #3 was a violation to R/W 7 RSA.

11. Given the optimistic forecasts developed for this Master Plan Update, will the plan be phased to construct the facilities, as they are needed at the Airport?

Answer: The Master Plan Update will develop a three-phased plan for development during the 5, 10 and 20-year planning period.

Answer: The City will bring projects forward as there is a need. (Eileen Enabnit)

Additional Questions submitted in writing:

12. I wanted some clarification concerning the Master Plan study and later federal funding for Airport improvements. As I understood from the meeting of February 9, any project that is NOT detailed in the Master Plan study is therefore NOT eligible for the 90% contribution from the federal government. If that statement were correct, then I would ask if the projects covered so far in the drafts of the Master Plan study are a little "un-ambitious". It seems that these improvements are just what is needed to meet the demands of the fleet mix at LUK as it is today.

Answer: At this phase of the process, the projects are based on no more than the requirements, which the consultants have identified per FAA established procedures, as what is needed to meet the forecast. Beyond that, the Airport doesn't have the financial ability to fund large capital improvement projects that are ineligible for FAA funding.

13. AIP Alternatives: Is anyone talking to or including anyone from Reeves Golf Course or CRC? Specifically, do we know which Alternatives would cause Reeves to lose the ability to have 18 holes? Would the Alternatives cause the elimination of the 9-hole, par-3 course? Would the football and baseball/softball fields be removed? I would like to know what exactly would be impacted in the rec. area before any Alternatives are chosen.

Answer: Yes, the City staff and consultants are discussing implications of the various layout Alternatives with CRC staff, to get more input from them, which will be presented to the oversight committee and the public. CRC Director, Jim Garges, appointed Jeff Koopman to fill his position as a CTAG member.

Next CTAG Meeting		March 16, 2004 H.C. Nutting Ctr. 4:00-7:00pm
--------------------------	--	---